DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 653 VT 010 428

TITLE	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968, PUBLIC LAW 90-576. SECCNL REPORT.
INSTITUTICN	NATICNAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, WASHINGTCN, D.C.
PUB DATE	15 NOV 69
NCTE	9P.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55
DESCRIPTORS	*ADVISORY COMMITTEES, *NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, *REPORTS, TECHNICAL EDUCATION, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
IDENTIFIERS	*NATIONAL ADVISCRY CCUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATICN

ABSTRACT

THE SECCND REPORT FRCM THE NATIONAL ADVISCRY COUNCIL CCNTAINS RECCMMENDATICNS WITH RESPECT TC COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER LEGISLATION, FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PCST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS, AND THE PCSITICN CF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATICN OF IHE FEDERAL GCVERNMENI. THE RECCMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL AROSE FRCM CONCERN FOR: (1) PERSCNS WHC ARE FLOWING INTO THE POOL OF UNEMPLOYED, AS WELL AS THCSE AIREADY UNEMPLCYED OR UNDEREMPLOYED, (2) DIRECTING THE DISADVANTAGED INTO THE MAINSTREAM OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATICN AS CAREER PREPARATION, RATHER THAN INTC SEPARATE PROGRAMS, (3) IHE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PRIMARILY TO COVER THE ADDITIONAL CCSTS OF VCCATICNAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION AS CAREER PREPARATION AS DISTINGUISHED FRCM THE TCTAL COSTS OF SUCH EDUCATICN, AND (4) COCRDINATICN OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AS WELL AS MANPOWER PROGRAMS. THE COUNCIL RECCMMENDED THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD INVEST IN REDUCING THE FICW CF UNTRAINED YOUTH, AND RECCMMENDED THREE IMMEDIATE ACTIONS TC IMPLEMENT THIS PCLICY. (GR)

ED036653

SECOND REPORT

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 Public Law 90-576

November 15, 1969

VT010428

ED036653

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

REGIONAL OFFICE BUILDING #3 • ROOM 5022 • 7TH AND D STREET, S.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202 • PHONE (202) 962-0454

HUGH CALKINS
Chairman

CALVIN DELLEFIELD
Executive Director

November 15, 1969

Honorable Robert H. Finch
Secretary
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We transmit with this letter, as our second report, recommendations with respect to comprehensive manpower legislation, Federal support for post-secondary institutions, and the position of vocational education in the administrative organization of the Federal government.

We believe that our recommendations, if adopted, would provide Federal support for the objective that education become as relevant for those American citizens who do not graduate from universities as for those who do.

Sincerely yours,

Hugh Calkins

Hugh Calkins

Enclosure

HCalkins:nvs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MICHAEL ALARID • FINLAY C. ALLAN • RICHARD G. ALLEN • H. S. BROWN • AGNES BRYANT • LOWELL A. BURKETT • HUGH CALKINS
AMO DeBERNARDIS • MARVIN J. FELDMAN • CERNORIA D. JOHNSON • OLIVER P. KOLSTOE • JOHN W. LETSON • W. E. LOWRY • JACK MICHIE
LUIS M. MORTON, JR. • CHARLES F. NICHOLS • GEORGE L. RAMEY • SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO • DONALD H. SMITH • ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education was created by the Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. It is composed of 21 persons, appointed by the President from diverse backgrounds in labor, management and education. It is charged by law to advise the Commissioner of Education concerning the operation of vocational education programs, make recommendations concerning such programs, and make annual reports to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmittal to Congress.

The First Annual Report of the Council, issued July 15, 1969, was concerned primarily with national attitudes and is available upon request.

SECOND REPORT
of the
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

In its First Report the Council pointed out that vocational education in the United States suffers from a national preoccupation that everyone must go to college. Government at all levels--school administrators, teachers, parents and students--are all guilty of the attitude that vocational education is designed for somebody else's children. What is needed, we urged, is a new respect for vocational and technical education as career preparation at all levels.

In the four months that have passed since we issued our First Report, the Council has considered the Federal approach to funding, the Office of Education's organization and role, and present and proposed manpower policies and legislation. In light of these considerations, this report recommends fundamental policy changes for the Federal government in these areas. If these policies are adopted they will provide Federal support for the objective that education become as relevant for those American citizens who do not graduate from universities as for those who do.

Our recommendations are based on four concerns:

1. A concern for persons who are flowing into the pool of unemployed as strong as our concern for those already among the unemployed and underemployed.

Last year the Federal government allocated $1.6 billion in support of recruiting, counseling, educating, training, and job placement efforts for approximately one million men and women who suffered under economic, educational, or physical handicaps. But as of last October, Labor Department statistics show that the unemployment rate in our poverty neighborhoods had

shown no over-the-year improvement.

In an average year, 700,000 young men and women drop out of the nation's schools before graduating. Some of these drop-outs find jobs, but many of them flow into the pool of unemployed, lacking the skills and preparation which would make them employable. To reduce this flow, in fiscal year 1968 the Federal government spent $65,[redacted] million for part-time jobs designed to keep youths in school and provided some portion--$10 million would be a generous estimate--of a total vocational education expenditure of $262,[redacted] million, for the career training of the disadvantaged.

The allocation of far more Federal dollars to the problem of the pool than to the problem of the flow is wasteful and inefficient. This nation will never reduce its pool of unemployed until the Federal government gives as much attention to reducing the flow as it gives to trying to reduce the pool.

2. A concern for directing the disadvantaged into the mainstream of vocational and technical education as career preparation, rather than into separate programs.

Federal legislation now encourages the development of separate programs for the disadvantaged. Such programs say to the disadvantaged that they are second-class citizens who cannot make it in the mainstream. Such programs appear to shut the door to career advancement. What the disadvantaged want and need is access to vocational and technical programs for career preparation in the mainstream. Counseling, tutoring and other support and assistance are essential, but separateness destroys dignity.

3. A concern that Federal funds be used primarily to cover the <u>additional</u> costs of vocational and technical education as career preparation as distinguished from the total costs of such education.

A principal reason local school districts have been slow to make vocational education programs available to all who want them is that the initial costs of vocational education are higher than for college preparatory programs. The efficient way to use the Federal dollar to encourage vocational and technical education as career preparation is for the Federal government to pay all or a substantial part of these extra costs. For example, an appropriate vocational program might cost the Federal government $1500-$3000 if the student enrolls in a separate, fully Federally-supported program, but a fraction of that amount would be needed if the Federal government paid only the extra cost of a vocational program for that student in a mainstream secondary or post-secondary school.

4. A concern for coordination of vocational education as well as manpower programs.

The inefficiency of the present uncoordinated and overlapping vocational education and manpower programs is widely recognized, and solutions have been proposed to the Congress. These proposals bring some order to manpower training, but fall far short of what is needed. They will fail in practice to make use of mainstream, secondary and post-secondary vocational and technical career development programs, and they will create in many communities a dual system of public education.

These concerns lead us to one fundamental policy: The Federal government should invest at least as much money in reducing the flow of untrained youth as it invests in reducing the pool of unemployed, and most of the Federal investment should be concentrated in paying the additional cost of vocational and technical programs of career preparation (as

compared with programs which prepare for further education) in high schools and post-secondary institutions.

To carry out this policy, the Federal government should take the following three actions now:

1. Require that communities develop coordinated plans for reducing both the flow of untrained youth and the pool of unemployed adults.

Legislation presently proposed by the Administration would establish in every community a prime sponsor, normally the mayor, who is to plan and administer Federal support for all manpower training within the community. In the Council's opinion such local planning, so directed, limited only to manpower, will further direct attention and money to the problem of the pool and away from the problem of the flow. It does not make sense to plan how to find jobs for the unemployed without also planning to prevent additional numbers of young people from flowing into the ranks of the unemployed.

The Council recommends:

First, that local communities be required and enabled to plan both to reduce the flow of untrained youth and to reduce the pool of unemployed.

Second, that the local plan employ, to the maximum, existing mainstream institutions and programs.

Third, that the local authority which prepares the plan and administers Federal support for the plan include not only the mayor, but also the superintendent of schools and the head of the appropriate post-secondary career development institution.

Fourth, that the local body which prepares the plan should include both professional and non-professional representatives of the local community.

Fifth, that the Federal funds which are subject to the plan include not only manpower training funds, but also vocational education and

related training funds earmarked for the disadvantaged.

Sixth, that the language of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, earmarking funds for the disadvantaged, be amended to eliminate the implication that programs for the disadvantaged must be separate programs.

Seventh, that Education be given an equal voice with Labor at state and Federal levels in supervising the formation and administration of the plan.

2. Focus Federal support for community colleges and other two-year post-secondary institutions on vocational and technical programs as career preparation.

Legislation proposed in the Senate extends general Federal aid to community colleges. Such general aid would do little to overcome our national preoccupation with general liberal arts education.

Federal funds should instead be the catalyst encouraging comprehensive community colleges and post-secondary institutions to expand and strengthen their vocational-technical career offerings. The same principle--that the Federal government pay the extra cost of a vocational program--should apply to post-secondary as well as to secondary education.

3. Overhaul the Federal administrative organization to permit the Federal government to exercise leadership in vocational education as well as in manpower training.

There is a reason why the Federal government is more effective in responding to the crisis of the pool of unemployed than in reducing the flow of untrained youth into the pool. That reason is that the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower is two doors removed from the President, while the Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational and Library Programs is five doors removed from the President. There is no more dramatic example in the Federal government of how national objectives are obstructed by a badly designed administrative organization.

We favor a separate Department of Education, for only in that way will Education speak in concert with Labor to meet the critical needs of the country for vocational and technical education as career preparation. Until that organization is achieved, we recommend that the position responsible for vocational education in the Office of Education parallel as nearly as possible the position responsible for manpower training in the Department of Labor.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh Calkins

Hugh Calkins, Chairman

Michael Alarid
Findlay C. Allan
Richard Allen
H. S. Brown
Agnes Bryant
Lowell A. Burkett
Hugh Calkins
Amo DeBernardis
Marvin J. Feldman
Cernoria D. Johnson
Oliver P. Kolstoe
John W. Letson
W. E. Lowry
Alice B. McLean
Jack Michie
Luis M. Morton, Jr.
Charles F. Nichols
George L. Ramey
Samuel H. Shapiro
Donald H. Smith
Robert M. Worthington

Members of the Advisory Council

GSA DC 70.5967